

pect that this work will be toted as the flagship of Pacific archaeology for years to come. As the years go by, and new themes in Pacific prehistory develop, *On the Road of the Winds* will remain an excellent historical statement of the current condition of the field.

## REFERENCES

- Bellwood, Peter. 1978. *Man's Conquest of the Pacific: The Prehistory of Southeast Asia and Oceania*. William Collins, Auckland.  
 Bellwood, Peter. 2000. Book Review: *On the Road of the Winds*. *Antiquity* 74(286):989-990.  
 Biersack, Alletta. 1991. *Clio in Oceania: Toward a Historical Anthropology*. Smithsonian Institution Press.  
 White, J. Peter. 2000. Book Review: *On the Road of the Winds*. *Asian Perspectives* 39:189-190.

### *Te Moana Nui. Exploring Lost Isles of the South Pacific*

Georgia Lee

Easter Island Foundation, 2001. [rapanuibooks@worldnet.att.net](mailto:rapanuibooks@worldnet.att.net) \$25  
 ISBN 1-880636-19-0

Review by Paul G. Bahn

The latest in the Easter Island Foundation's excellent series of publications constitutes a delightful journey through a wide variety of islands in the South Pacific – including Rapa Nui – in the company of Georgia Lee who has had the rare good fortune to visit them all aboard the cruise ship *World Discoverer*. This is a book which can be either dipped into or read cover to cover – it contains something for everyone, from pre-history to scandals, from artistic rogues to sadistic clergymen, from warfare to movies, from pearls to politics, from Robinson Crusoe to Moby Dick – and of course there is the ever-popular mutiny on the *Bounty* and many other ripping yarns.

For each island or group, a map is provided, as well as a timeline of important events. In each case, the author gives us a brief history of the island, and of the characters involved in it, as well as of the present-day conditions of the place and its people. Alongside the many familiar tales such as those of Paul Gauguin or Alexander Selkirk, one encounters fascinating tidbits such as the fact that it was Pitcairn Island which was the first community anywhere to adopt women's suffrage and compulsory education, or that Easter Island is probably the only place in the world where introduced rabbits were eaten by people before they could multiply! In the margins one finds a well-chosen potpourri of quotations from poems, chants, songs, letters and texts, featuring people as diverse as Bill Mulloy, Carlyle Smith, Rupert Brooke and Herman Melville. Overall, the book's design is outstanding, with chapter openings strikingly superimposed on large photographs, and one can forgive the occasional typographic error and a bibliography that is not always in alphabetical order.

This miscellaneous collection of studies of the often tragic pasts and uncertain futures of these wonderful and remote islands is warmly recommended to all those who have any kind of interest in the Pacific region. Who can resist tales of pirate treasure and castaways?

### *Possessive Markers in Central Pacific Languages*

Edited by Steven Roger Fischer

Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, Universität Bremen, Postfach 22 04 40, D28334 Bremen, Germany

Review by Joseph C. Finney

This book was published as a special issue of the German (Berlin) journal, *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, with the translating subtitle: "Language Typology and Universals". In all the papers quoted here, an asterisk denotes a hypothetical reconstruction of an ancestral form, and not an ungrammatical form (its other common use).

The Central Pacific languages (a group with common ancestry) are the Polynesian languages (and dialects), the Fijian communalects (where the distinctions between languages and dialects is unclear), and Rotuman. Fijian and Rotuman probably share a common ancestry that is not shared by Polynesians. Central Pacific is a unit within Oceanic, a subgroup within Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, which is a subdivision of Malayo-Polynesian, which is one of the ten divisions of the Austronesian family of languages.

Of the twelve papers, one deals with the Central Pacific group as a whole, one with Fijian, one with Rotuman, one with the Polynesian group as a whole; and each of the remaining eight deals with a specific Polynesian language: (Tongan and Niuēan in the Tongic group; Tokelauan, Pileni, and East Uvean in the Samoic-Outlier group; and Rapanui, Hawaiian, and Māori in East Polynesian).

The guest editor, Steven Fisher, who also contributed a paper, did well in his selection of the eleven other authors to cover various languages of Central Pacific. The authors know their languages well and they have very ably analyzed the marking of possessive markers in Central Pacific Languages.

#### JOHN LYNCH'S HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Lynch begins his historical overview by noting that Central Pacific is a division of the Oceanic languages, which includes some 450 languages. That is about half the (1000 or so) languages in the Austronesian family, though Oceanic is a small sub-sub-sub division within the family. Citing his own work and others, he notes that Proto-Oceanic (henceforth POc) had two basic ways of marking possession. The simpler and perhaps older one was Direct possession. It was used in POc for certain inalienable relations, notably kin terms, parts of something, and passive possession, things done to the possessor (his destruction of her).

Direct possession puts the possessed thing at the left, after its article (ART). The possessor is on the right. Because of ancestral syntactic changes that we need not consider (ancestral genitive-ergative becoming nominative in Proto Central-Eastern MP), it is hard to tell whether an "of" element is present at the beginning of the possessor pronoun suffix or not. The issue is not discussed. If the possessor is a pronoun, it is attached as a suffix on the possessed object. Lynch's examples from Proto-Oceanic (hence preceded by an asterisk) are:

Direct possession is almost totally lost in Rotuman and

especially Polynesian, where Lynch (citing Wilson 1982) notes it is used with only half-dozen kin terms and even there only in the singular, where for a pronoun possessor it comes out, e.g., "father-me" (or "father-my, father of me" if we regard a hidden genitive preposition as present). An abbreviated or contracted construction of this sort is likely to be a more ancient construction that has suffered lenition. (Here I am supplying an explanation not expressed by Lynch).

The other type, called indirect possession, was used in Proto Central Pacific for alienable possessions, with separate markers for three types: food, drink, and general. (This is the sort of elaboration that occurs to aid comprehension by restoring a greater ratio of observable cue to meaning). What Proto-Polynesian (PPN) has subsequently done is to rearrange the three types of indirect possession into two, one marked by the particle "A" and the other by "O". As we shall see, there are at least two differing ways of characterizing the basic difference between an "A" possession and an "O" possession: in terms of "control" or of "alienability." In a complex way, Polynesian's "A" marker (controlling or alienable possession) comes down from the ancestral marker for general possessions, and Polynesian's "O" from ancestral "qo" which had increasingly come to be used with passives, kin terms and parts. It is a very complex prehistory that has to be constructed. Lynch cites works by Pawley and Geraghty, which are well known to specialists in Polynesia.

Lynch's paper is fascinating not only for what it says (ancestral to what is found altered in Polynesian) but also for what Lynch seems to imply about an earlier syntactic change without quite saying so. Lynch is nearly always right in his conclusions and one can only wish that he would take a stronger stand.

#### PAUL GERAGHTY ON FIJIAN

Geraghty is the person who has studied more thoroughly than anyone else the Fijian language (languages? dialects? communalects?). I have seen him in Fiji, wearing a wrap-around skirt to show his political solidarity with indigenous Fijians. He has lived and worked in that country (and before that, British colony) for many years.

Geraghty's paper covers Possession in the Fijian "communalects" and Geraghty is unquestionably the man who knows those languages or dialects. The whole area may be considered as a chain of dialects, in which people can easily understand those near them in the chain but not those farther away in the chain. The general distinction made in linguistics is that if two individuals can understand each other, they are speaking the same language, though different dialects within the language; while if they can't understand each other, they speak different languages. That dichotomy breaks down in dialect chains. It may be that a common ancestor gave rise to East Fijian, Rotuman, and Polynesian; and that a different ancestor (though not very different as it is also Oceanic) gave rise to West Fijian. Similarly, though English (with Frisian, Dutch and German) is descended from Proto West Germanic, while Danish (with Norwegian and Swedish and somewhat more distant Icelandic and Faroese) is descended from Proto North Germanic) the Danes who occupied most of England for a hundred years, ending

shortly before the Norman conquest, may have had some ability to understand the English and vice versa, which allowed English to borrow pronouns (they and them) from the Danish words that were homologous with English "these" and those", replacing the older English plural pronouns beginning with h-. By this theory, East Fijian and West Fijian grew close together so that nowadays it is not inappropriate to consider them members of a common Fijian language, though as Geraghty notes, there is a comprehension boundary between them.

Geraghty reports recent research beyond what he has previously published. He notes that Lynch disputes his expressed view that Proto Polynesian is most closely related to the languages of Lau [in Fiji] and eastern Vanualevu." Geraghty concludes, "Vanualevu is thus the only part of Fiji where are to be found the three prerequisites for the Polynesian marker set: glottal stop initial general marker, loss of direct possession for most inalienables, and loss of general marker after the article.... Vanualevu therefore remains the most likely location for the origin of the Polynesian languages as a distinct entity."

#### HANS SCHMIDT ON ROTUMAN

Schmidt's paper discusses at length the Possession Markers in Rotuman. He notes that more than 2/3 of the Rotumans have left the island to live in the urban centers of Fiji, or even 'abroad' (i.e., outside the Republic of Fiji, in which Rotuma is a part).

Schmidt uses the word "gender" for the two possessive markers and the class of possessed objects for which each is used. For one class, the possessed objects are food, and for the other class they are non-food. But without a sense of contradiction, he gives two phrases using the same noun as the possessed object but different in gender. One is "your plate" (with non-food gender); the other is "your plate of food" where, as in English, the noun "plate" is the head of a phrase that refers, in a sense, to food. (Think of the English sentence: "I drank a cup of coffee", or "I ate a plate of food" in which I really ate the food, not the plate. A figure of speech is involved.)

Schmidt's ability to write flawlessly in English is remarkable for a native German speaker. He made only one error, saying "perceive a difference in meaning between both suffixes" where a native speaker would say "between two suffixes".

#### ROSS CLARK ON POLYNESIAN LANGUAGES IN GENERAL

Ross Clark is a Canadian, teaching in New Zealand. His knowledge of Polynesian languages is phenomenal. It may be that he converses fluently in more Polynesian languages than anyone else, unless it is Andy Pawley. He has taken a prominent role in controversies about the diachronic syntax of Proto-Polynesian, and he has been right more often than not. He gives a discussion of possessive markers in Polynesian languages in general.

Clark begins by telling us "Polynesian is a family of about 35 closely-related languages within the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian. Polynesian languages share numerous innovations in all aspects of their structure. In keeping with this general picture, Polynesian possession, while it can be seen as an example of a general Oceanic type, has a number of distinctive peculiarities, with just enough variation within the family to

make comparative reconstruction of the system interesting." He notes that Polynesian divides into two major divisions, Tongic and Nuclear Polynesian, with the latter dividing into Samoic-Outlier and East Polynesian.

He states: "Central to the possessive system in almost all PN languages is a contrast between two categories of possession, which may conveniently be labeled A and O possession." He notes that the PPN forms of the possessive morpheme had an initial glottal stop for the A form but not for the O form. He is correct in detecting the difference in Tongan, even though the distinction is no longer made by all speakers there; and he is right in confirming the glottal distinction by looking for it in Rapanui and finding it there. An expert knows where to look. One of his sentences shows the glottal in the A form in Rennellese. (Still we find glottals in Bennardo's paper on Tongan and Fischer's on Rapanui, that are unexpected if Clark is correct). Clark sees that the specific article *te* combines with a forming (presumably first *te-ana* and then) *taana*, which in many languages shortens to *tana*, his.

Likewise for the O form, assimilation produces *toona*, *tona*. And for "my", with the phrase *te a aku* becomes *taaku*, *taku* and *te o aku* becomes *tooku*, *toku*, although Clark doesn't specifically say so. He doesn't notice that in an example sentence he quotes from Rennellese, an irregular *o'oku* has a glottal in contradiction to the differentiation that he rightly attributed to PPN, and so it must come by false analogy with *a'aku*. At that point he notes that not only PPN *a'a* and *aa* but also PPN *o'o* and *oo* contract to simple vowels. He gives convincing examples of PN languages innovating plural forms of the specific and the nonspecific article. (For the archaeologists and other non-linguists who get this publication, note that although English articles are definite ("the") and indefinite ("a"), whenever the English "a" means "a certain" it translates into Austronesian languages as the specific article, not the nonspecific.)

Clark notes that total loss of the A/O opposition has taken place at least twice: in Niuē and in a group of Northern Outliers including Luangia. In both, the A form is the one that survives, an outcome that Clark regards as unexpected from the perception that O is the unmarked form.

#### GIOGANNI BENNARDO ON TONGAN

Bennardo notes that Oceanic A and O possession corresponds to the relation between possessor and possessed: dominant/subordinate as phrased by Pawley (1973) and Lynch (1982): control/non-control (Wilson 1982); or alienable; inalienable (Lichtenberk 1985). He cites a Tongan woman, Taumoeofolau, as rejecting all those analyses and proposing another dichotomy using metaphor and prototype theory. Bennardo proposes a new dichotomy: A for movement away from me and O for movement toward me.

In his Tongan examples, Bennardo cites the A and O forms as *a* and *o*, despite Lynch's argument that the ancestral O form had no glottal although the majority of Tongans put it there by false analogy with the A form.

Bennardo endorses Taumoeofolau's concept that the prototypical A possession pronoun is activity-oriented, has verbal function, and produces an activity like "going" done by an agent. In contrast, the O possession pronouns are part-oriented,

have part-function, and represent the passive receivers of the activity. But perhaps paradoxically, A forms can also be receivers in Tongan.

Bennardo reproduces a spatial diagram in which semantics (Conceptual Structures) is related directly through syntactic structures to other linguistic processes. But Conceptual Structure, in the opposite direction, is related to spatial representation and to sensory input, neither of which is linguistic.

Bennardo quotes me as suggesting that any adequate proposal about Polynesian possession should be able to explain the controversial treatment of body parts as O-possessed. It doesn't always seem true that we are affected by our O possessions and we don't affect them. Bennardo notes that Fischer told him that in Rapanui A is used for "my clothes" (given to me to wash), while O is used for "my clothes" (that I wear). (I can add that in Hawaiian and Tuvalu, only the clothes that I wear next to my skin are O possessions.)

#### DIANE MASAM AND WOLFGANG SPERLING ON NIUEAN

Sentences in Niuean are inherently confusing to the uninitiated. The casemarker "e" for the ergative case for pronouns is identical in writing and in sound with the case-marker "e" for the absolutive case for nouns. As usual, it is the pronouns that are conservative; they keep the ancestral marking as in Tongan. For nouns, Niuē used the ancestral specific article "e" as the absolutive case marker, and the ancestral nonspecific article "a" as the ergative (and genitive) case-marker. And where did Tongan get "e" as its specific article? It is the PAN "di", PPN "re", which is "le" in Samoan, but in most Nuclear PN languages loses out to its competitor "te". With that knowledge, and when we add that, following Seiter (1980), Massam and Sperlich chose to mark the Absolutive case not as ABS but as NOM (for Nominative), you will be able to follow the Massam and Sperling quoted sentences. You need to know that in the sequence "ko e" in which "ko" (presentive case marker) may be called a marker of predicate noun, with "e" as Absolutive (their Nominative), Massam/Sperlich choose to mark the two particles together as PRED (for predicate nouns). Now that you know all that, you can take the Niuean sentences as given, and translate them into their equivalent in Tongan or Samoan or whatever other Polynesian language you know best, and thereby find a familiar expression of the syntax.

Massam and Sperlich's final sentence is: "It was observed that there is a fundamental relation between location and possession, and the description of relative clauses [sic] possessives led to the observation that there is also a fundamental relation between agentivity and possession, which involves control by one entity over another."

Note that this is part of the general laws of diachronic syntax. Prepositions meaning "of" come from ancestors that meant "from". Space relations are the source of expression of abstract relations. It was scarcely more than 200 years ago that in English we began to use different spellings for the (genitive) "of" and the (ablative) "off" that still expresses a "from" space relation.

#### ROBIN HOOPER ON TOKELAUAN

Hooper's conclusion takes only seven concise sentences,



so I'll give it in full: "I have suggested that the semantic contrast that forms the basis of the Tokelau use of A and O forms is that when A is used, the possessor is felt to be the initiator or controller of the relationship. When O is used, there is no such implication. While many nominals occur with either marker, depending on context, it is also the case that conventionalized uses are common, as in other Polynesian languages which have the A/O contrast. Some nouns always take one or the other marker (**fale**, **faifa**). Some relationships are seen as controlled (that of the speaker to the speech act) or uncontrolled (that of the thinker to the thought). In such cases, the semantic basis of the convention is not hard to discern. Other cases seem somewhat opaque, at least to the non-native speaker. The active nature of the contrast in the contemporary language can be seen in the ease with which lexical items borrowed from English are assigned their appropriate possessive markers: **tana advice**, **te keen o oku**, **nā talk a lātou**." ["his (A) advice, your (O) keenness, their (A) talk."]

She calls O and A "possessive prepositions" and they seem to function as such in today's Polynesian tongues, though we have noted that ancestrally they seem to have been classifiers that had to be followed by possessive genitives. She notes that the O and A phrases function as adjuncts within a noun phrase, or as nuclei of possessive predicates; and not as adjuncts to the verb. She also notes that the [intended] benefactive prepositions **mō** and **mā** ("for") can introduce adjuncts of predicate verbs.

The major part of Hooper's paper is a long section called "The Semantics of Possessor Marking". Here she notes that the term "possession" is "only marginally suitable." I take the central idea of A possession to be initiation or selection of the relationship and control over its continuance." (That seems to contradict the definition of O possession as inalienable and A possession as alienable. In languages such as Hawaiian, as well as Tuvalu, close language is very close to Tokelauan, the child has inalienable O possession of its parents, while the parent has only alienable A possession of the child). Indeed, Hopper agrees by saying "Within the domain of actions and states, the most prototypical A possessions are transitory items of personal property or use, and the most prototypical O possessions are body parts and other parts of wholes." But she goes on to say, "Within the domain of actions and states, the most prototypical A relation is that of the agent noun phrase of a transitive verb to the action performed, and the most prototypical O relation is that of the patient to the transitive action." She adds, "[T]he majority of nouns can occur as the head of both A class and O class con[s]tructions, and that the choice of [A,O] depends primarily upon the way the relationship between the possessor and the possessed is conceptualized." Hooper does outstanding work in framing concepts and apply them to the study of facts. Here is, in my judgment, the most outstanding paper of the group.

#### A°SHILD NAESS ON PILENI

Naess defines the A,O distinction as one of the degree of control the possessor exercises, not over the possessed item but over the relation of possession. If the possessor can buy or sell or give the item away, it is an A possession. In contrast, the

term "alienability" refers to the relation between the possessor and the possessed item itself.

Basic kinship terms are the only words that allow (or in some cases require) a possessive suffix (direct possession).

There is some interesting but unexplained variation in phonology of personal pronouns. Marking of vowel length varies in the basic (left) syllables of dual and plural pronouns. It is hard to tell how much of the variation is in the language and how much is in Naess's transcription. Naess uses occasional macrons for vowel length, but usually not in those pronouns. Independently of the A/O choice, inalienables (kin terms and body parts) take pronominal suffixes, while alienable social relations are expressed by normal full pronouns.

#### CLAIRE MOISE-FAURIE ON EAST UVEAN

East Uvea belongs to the Samoic-Outlier group. But Tongans have conquered it and ruled it, and so a heavy dose of Tonganism has been grafted into the language. Besides A and O, Uvea also shows, for partitives, simple sequencing, as **konga mei** (piece of breadfruit) and **va'a mago** (branch of mango tree). Partitives may also insert a preposition 'i, but because of the contaminated history, one cannot say whether that is PPN **ki** or **i**. I suspect it is PPN **i** with Tongan elaboration of prosodic glottals into initial lexical position.

Besides the "Ordinary possessive adjectives" there is a table of "Emphatic possessive adjectives", as well as a means of expressing emphasis by postposing the 3s personal pronoun **ia**. The author manages to make a virtue out of this hotchpot. "This wealth of possessive pronominal forms is not left unexploited. Individually or in combination, they make it possible to express varying degrees of emphasis as listed below, from the weakest (a) to the strongest (d)." The A/O distinction also appears in the benefactive (potential possession) prepositions **ma'a** and **mo'o** ("for").

Moise-Faurie points out that expressions such as "That knife is mine" and "That is John's shirt" are seldom used except as answers to questions. She notes that lexical words in the language are remarkably polyvalent: "Almost any of them can head either a noun phrase or a verb phrase without formal variation." They are nouns if they take articles, possessors, prepositions, or casemarkers. But the presence of typical verbal paraphernalia such as directionals, negatives, and even Tense-Aspect markers does not prevent the element from being something other than a verb.

The intransitive verbs are divided into patient oriented and agent oriented (which she does not call unaccusative and unergative). That determines whether the nominalized form will take A for O possession. Some verbs can be used both ways.

In her conclusions, French speaking Moise-Faurie remarks that, from Uvean, where various nouns may be terms in the predicate, translations may be difficult into French which, she says, has only one formal type of associative construction, the **de** phrase. Moise-Faurie is a good logical thinker, and her paper is one of the best in the volume.

#### STEVEN ROGER FISCHER ON RAPANUI

Here we have Fischer in his element, writing on the syntax of a dying language in which he is perhaps the world's leading

expert. He begins by describing the state of the language as follows: "The term 'Modern Rapanui' is a blanket designation for the rapidly changing current idiom that has experienced massive Tahitian intrusion for over a century and intense Hispanicization for more than thirty years. Any study treating the Rapanui language must acknowledge Rapanui's accelerating change in progress; indeed, the language is mutating so swiftly that forms common a generation ago are today sometimes regarded as ungrammatical by speakers under forty. Most disconcerting is the fact that Rapanui is now being replaced, in all contexts, by Chilean Spanish."

Rapanui sentences look like Tongan in being full of glottal stops. Loss of PPN glottals occurred in Proto-Samoic-Outlier, and also in Mainline East PN after Rapanui had broken off from it. For the non-linguists, note that English has only three words with glottal stops: uh-huh (yes), oh-oh or un-oh (something unfortunate has just happened), and ah-ah-ah (don't do what you seem about to do). All three have marginal standing as words in English.

Fischer's examples raise an interesting question that he does not discuss: does the A/O particle in Rapanui begin with a glottal stop or not? The issue doesn't arise in most PN languages as they have lost the glottal; but it arises in Rapanui (and Tongan). When Steve shows 'a Rui (of Rui) and 'a au (of me) and 'o te hare, we must say that the A and O particles begin with a glottal. But he also shows the specific article *te* in Rapanui combining with A/O to produce forms *to* (in *to'oku* and *to te ngā ngā vi'e*), and *ta* (in *tā Rui*), we must say that there is no initial glottal for the A and O possessive words.

Fischer correctly notes that in Rapanui, the locative preposition "i" and not the O participle is used for "possessor" of locative nouns (on top of the house) though some other PN languages use the participle O there. In some sentences, but not others, he spells that locative preposition with initial glottal.

I venture to say that today there is no English speaker who knows Rapanui as thoroughly as does Steve Fischer.

#### KENNETH WILLIAM COOK ON HAWAIIAN

Ken Cook was a good choice to write about Possessive Markers in Hawaiian. He is one of the best-informed scholars of the Hawaiian language. It is to Cook's advantage that so many have written about Hawaiian; but perhaps also to his disadvantage. Naess could say anything about Pileni and almost no one could contradict him. Cook wisely quotes leading scholars who have already written about Hawaiian.

Cook quotes Wilson (1982), who invented the capital A,O designation and who said that A is used if the person has control on the RELATION between himself and the "possessed" object. There was an exception: O is used when the possessor has control over the item but uses it as a location. Cook quotes as another exception, that O is used if the possessed item is worn. Inanimate possessors never have control, and so they regularly take O possessions.

As we have seen in the other languages, to the left of the A/O vowel may be zero or a consonant where a CV (consonant+vowel) syllable has (usually) merged its vowel with the A or O. When the syllable is a preposition *m-* (ancestrally "toward" or "for") or *n-* (ancestrally "from" but "for" in Hawai-

ian) the preposition's vowel normally is absorbed into the A or O. Cook gives the details on the use and interpretation of "na" and "no" phrases. Cook notes that the *no* forms are used for non-possessive expressions of cause, reason, and purpose, as well as goals, benefactives, durations, and associations.

Cook discusses the circumstances in which Wilson's generalization (A as control) doesn't work. He cites Sandra Chung's diachronic theory that in PPN, A marked transitive subjects and O marked intransitive subjects of nominalizations. (Can they be combined, as when in English we say "his destroying of the city" with roles for different genitives?) Cook goes on to propose that in Hawaiian, the innovative O marking was adopted for intransitive subjects of nominalizations and later spread to transitive subjects of nominalizations.

A committee of seven missionaries who were translating the Bible in Hawai'i voted 4 to 3 to spell a phoneme "k" and not "t". Unlike the Hawaiians, Samoans were lucky enough to have it spelt correctly. That is an advantage if, like me, you would like to encourage the various Polynesian peoples to communicate with one another.

#### RAY HARLOW ON MĀORI

Harlow succinctly sets the goals of his paper: "As in most Polynesian languages, and like other head-dependent constructions in Māori, the Māori possessive system is exclusively dependent-marking; that is the possessor is case-marked as such and the possessum's form is unaffected by the construction. Again, as in most Polynesian languages, and with two exceptions which will be mentioned below, the case marking of possessors in Māori involves two sets of particles, one with a characteristic vowel *a*, the other with *o*. This paper aims to set out all the forms involved in possessive marking in Māori, to describe their syntax, to summarize the ongoing discussion on the distinction between the so-called A and O categories, and to list the uses of possessive markers in adverbial functions."

Like Fischer, Naess, and Hooper, Harlow uses the abbreviation DET (determiner) which is standard in generative grammar but not used by other authors in this symposium. From a certain point of view, that puts him more in the mainstream of linguistics. Determiners (articles) are what show plurality in DET phrases in many Polynesian languages. Harlow says that in Māori, only eight nouns (all denoting human beings) show such a distinction. (In contrast, Samoan has a fairly great number of nouns that use reduplication to show plurality. Personal pronouns in Polynesian show singular, dual and plural.)

Māori has both the *nA/nO* and the *mA/mO* classes of possessives, and both are used in canonical possessive constructions and in certain adverbial phrases. In Māori, as in Polynesian language in general, locative nouns ("on top of") occur (as in English) without articles or other determiners. And in Māori as in other Polynesian tongues, the "on top of" phrase can end either with the traditional locative preposition (*i*, "at" that is almost universal throughout AN languages) or with the quasi-preposition *O* that is the topic of the symposium and which developed only in Central Pacific from what may have been ancestrally a classificatory noun. Harlow's paper is highly systematic, scholarly, and professional. It must be regarded as one of the best submitted.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

In scientific linguistic papers it is customary to cite sentences from any language in three lines. The first line gives the sentence, word for word, in its own language. In the second line, below each word or morpheme, is a translation or identification of the word. Nouns, verbs and adjectives (and sometimes even prepositions) are translated into English. Function words and grammatical morphemes, such as case-markers, are translated in capital letters such as DET for determiner, NOM for nominative, and TA for markers of tense and aspect. The third line gives a free translation into English.

From the way the Abbreviations are dealt with, it is clear that no more than two of the dozen papers had an author who had ever read the Journal. The editor of the Journal gives "Notes for Authors" on the unnumbered first page. Of the eight instructions, number 6 is Abbreviations: "Abbreviations in the main body of the text should be restricted to a minimum. The abbreviations together with the explanations used in the text and in morpheme glosses are to be listed between the main body of the text and the bibliography under the title 'Abbreviations.'"

Only two of the twelve authors followed these instructions: Schmidt and Masam and Sperlich. Of the other ten, seven gave the Abbreviations in footnotes on the first or second page of their papers. That is the common way in English language publications and I prefer it, but it's not what the format for contributors prescribes. The other three, unfortunately, did not list them at all.

The guest editor would have been wise if he had ascertained the prescribed procedure and had instructed the other authors about it.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

These are all good papers. The authors know their languages well, and they have ably analyzed the marking of possessive markers in Central Pacific languages. This is a collection of papers that was well worth soliciting and publishing. What else can I say? A few things:

1) As good as they are, reading them begins to seem repetitive. Within the Polynesian group, the languages are so much alike that the various authors kept saying much the same thing. I suppose that is unavoidable. Each language has its own independent analysis and each author wrote his or her paper without knowing exactly what the others would say.

2) Of all the islands of Tuvalu, Nanumanga, the island where I spent most of two years is the only one in which (optionally) people can speak of their husbands and wives as O possessions ("toku vaaenga"). Does that mean marriages are less likely to end in divorce than on other islands? I don't know. Divorce is not common on any of the Tuvalu islands. Where else in Polynesia is this option found?

3) The t-possessives **toku**, **taku**, **tou**, **tau**, **tona**, **tana** (my, your, his or her, in O and A forms) and contractions of (for example), article **te**, preposition **of**, pronoun **him/her**. But what if **te o na** were to contract, not to **tona** (and the like) but to **tena** (and the like)? And what if **te a na** were to contract not to **tana** (and the like) but to **tena** and the like?

This happens, optionally, in the two Polynesian languages that I studied the most: Hawaiian and Tuvalu. In those two

places (and nowhere else that I know) there are commonly used optional forms **tena** for both **tana** and **tona** (very seldom with **e** in the first and second person forms). I am not the first to identify linguistic traits in common to Hawaiian and Tuvalu, though in 1971 I may have been the first to find this one.

4) In dictionaries of Hawaiian (Elbert and Puku'i 1971) and of Tuamotu (Stimson and Marshall 1964), occur two different words **na**, with on recognition that they are different words of different origin. One is a simple preposition for the agent of a sentence. It can be traced all the way back to Proto-Austronesian, where it had the usual vowel variation (-i for humans, -a for nonspecific common nouns of non-humans, and -u as the default). In various AN languages, it largely kept the ancient "from" meaning, while also developing (as ablatives do in perhaps all language families) additional uses as "by" (agent), and "of" (genitive). In Hawaiian and Tuamotuan it denotes the agent. There is no O form. The other is a compound word. It occurs both as "**na**" and as "**no**" with the usual differentiation between A and O forms. It was formed from the "**na**" preposition (or vowel variants of it such as **ni**), plus the classificatory noun A/O. This word forms the so-called **n-series** of possessives.

To support this conclusion, notice that in Puku'i/Elbert dictionary, "**na**" is defined as "by, for, belonging to"; used both for agent and as an A possessive. Two words of different ancestry (an ancient agent marker, and a possessive containing the A classifier) are being listed as if they were different usages of the same word and had the same ancestry. In contrast, "**no**" is defined "of, for, because of, resulting from, concerning, about, from". That is clearly an O possessive, and it is not used for agents. In the Tuamotu dictionary it is marked as "Obs (archaic or obsolete usage): consecrated to; for." I suggest that in that language too, it is an O possessive.

5) In Tuvalu, the word "**mea**" (thing) has one use with A possession and another with O possession. The phrase **tau mea** means your thing, as in some small object you carry in your hand. But the O possessive, **tou mea**, is a euphemism for your thing, your sex organ, male or female as the case may be. Once at a social gathering in Tuvalu a young woman was joking that she was a man. I challenged her, "Faka-asi mai tou mea." (Show me your thing). Everyone laughed. It was the first time I had tried to make a joke in the language and I took its success as a sign that I was beginning to achieve some mastery of the language.

## REFERENCES

- Elbert, S. and M. K. Puku'i. 1971. *Hawaiian Dictionary*. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.
- Lichtenberk, F. 1985. Possessive Constructions in Oceanic Languages and in Proto-Oceanic. *Austronesian Linguistics at the 15<sup>th</sup> Pacific Studies Science Congress*. A. Pawley and L. Carrington, eds. Pacific Linguistics C-88. ANU, Canberra.
- Lynch, J. 1982. Towards a Theory of the Origin of the Oceanic Possessive Constructions. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Vol. 1: Currents in Oceanic*. A. Halim, L. Carrington and S. Wurm, eds. Pacific Linguistics C-74. ANU, Canberra.
- Pawley, A. 1973. Some Problems in Proto-Oceanic Grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:103-188. University of Hawaii Press.



- Seiter, W. 1980. *Studies in Niuean Syntax*. Garland Publishing, New York.
- Stimson, J. F. and D. S. Marshall. 1964. *A Dictionary of some Tuamotuan Dialects of the Polynesian Language*. The Peabody Museum (Salem) and the Royal Institutes of Linguistics and Anthropology, The Hague.
- Wilson, W. H. 1982. Proto-Polynesian Possessive Marking. *Pacific Linguistics* B-85. ANU, Canberra.

## CD REVIEWS

### CD-ROM RESOURCES

Review by GRANT MCCALL  
Centre for South Pacific Studies  
University of New South Wales

I have been meaning to write this summary review for some time and it takes a period of research on Rapanui to give me the space to put together my thoughts on some CD-ROM resources that have been produced in the last few years. These offer both specialist and generalist information on the Pacific Islands and, especially, Rapanui.

As a visit to any computer shop will reveal, there is no lack of material on CD-ROMs, Compact Disc – Read Only Media – from porn to paying taxes, including a not small number of encyclopaedias and other reference materials. Late in this plethora of sources has been material on the Pacific Islands.

That situation is being remedied rapidly with the issue of both specialist and generalist resources, four of which I want to take up here, with special reference, for *RNJ*, to Rapanui. All four above listed are cross platform: that is, whether you have the Mac or prefer to suffer for your computing with Windows, these resources will work easily.

Lal, Brij V. and Kate Fortune. 2000. *The Pacific Islands. An encyclopaedia*. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press.  
<http://www.uhpress.hawaii.edu> \$100

Let's begin with the most ambitious and comprehensive of the lot and that is, as you would expect, the Lal and Fortune *Encyclopaedia*, which in spite of its date of publication is only recently available in 2001. This is also the most expensive, but the set comprises a hard bound, 664 page book, along with the CD-ROM, which comes in a plastic pocket on the inside of the back cover. All that is in the print version is on the CD, including photographs and maps. The format used on the CD is Adobe Acrobat, a free program that is included on the disc. Just click and go. The advantages of the CD over print become immediately obvious for searching and cross-referencing: the index is a series of links to the main text. In short, for concise, well written, authoritative articles this is your source. There really is nothing like it in English or, for all I know, in any other language. There are maps, photographs old and new, drawings and articles on people, places and main features of the Pacific Islands.

The emphasis in the eight chapters is on culture, society and history, with a chapter on each, along with the last one, which has 37 "Island profiles", including a particularly good one of Rapanui. No, I shouldn't say that! The rest is very com-

plete and will answer any questions that most are likely to ask about the Pacific. There are references for further study as well. It is a starting place for both the researcher and the traveler who wants to be well-informed before arrival. There is just enough illustrative material so that the armchair traveler can enjoy the journey as well, although that is not the market for this exhaustive work.

But, and this is the only draw back that this source has, it is an academic production or, at least, a production by academics for themselves and a wider audience, the latter being conceived as the educated public. No, there is no jargon: mercifully, it is free of obscurantism. It is a very serious volume/disc with no frivolity, but plenty of well printed color reproductions.

Considering its content, it is the cheapest of the four sources I review. And, please let me emphasize, I am not saying that to please my mates or because I was a contributor to a very small part of this magisterial effort: have a look yourself, since there should be no trouble in finding it from the University of Hawai'i Press.

Tahiti. *Magie des Iles de Polynésie*. 1998. Pape'ete, Pacific-Image and Océane Productions. [infos@pacific-image.pf](mailto:infos@pacific-image.pf) XPF 6000 (ca. \$60)

Tahiti is altogether a very different production, intended for a larger market and just bursting with excellent and attractive design, color, videos and vibrant music. It is in French, mono-linguals be warned, but the disc really plays itself and one can just sit back and enjoy the music and the tour. Some very clever people spent a lot of time thinking about how to present a mass of material in a way that will grab and hold the attention of anyone, mature or of the sound-byte generation (phrase intentional). There are 700 splendid images, 25 minutes of video in all manner of Polynesian topics through which is woven 60 minutes of beautifully recorded music. Océane Production is one of the co-producers and they have provided a selection of some of their best audio CDs for the soundtrack. The video carries a commentary and, as well, there is 35 minutes of attractive male and female voice-over on many of the topics. Even if you don't understand the French, the sound carries one through the accompanying images and music.

This is not an academic production, as is the *Encyclopaedia*, but one intended for a broad audience, as easy to watch and listen to as a video and whilst the price may seem high, most things in Pape'ete are so, except for *les baguettes*! There is a "travel" and an information section, each serving its purpose, to inform, but also to entertain.

Album 2000. 2001. Pape'ete, Office des Postes et Télécommunications. <http://www.opt.pf>. XPF 4500 (ca. \$45)

Album 2000, which appeared in early 2001, has images of 245 stamps and 107 telephone cards from French Polynesia, showing different aspects of that territory's culture and history, at least as seen from a French point of view published over ten years. Pretty dry, eh? Not so. Running throughout the chronologically and thematically organized CD is a terrific sound track of contemporary Tahitian (yes, only Tahitian as far as I could determine) music! If you have never seen post office productions from French Polynesia, order this disc and have a look;